



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL NOTES.

1. It is well known that in fulness and explicitness of statement, Herodotus often reminds the reader of his great exemplar, Homer. Zeugmata and other modes of pregnant expression are practically unknown to his style. In VIII 124, however, we read: ἀριστήϊα μὲν νυν ἔδοσαν Εὐρυβιάδῃ ἐλαίης στέφανον, σοφίης δὲ καὶ δεξιότητος Θεμιστοκλέϊ, καὶ τούτῳ στέφανον ἐλαίης. In the present passage, ἀριστήϊα must be understood to mean the *prize* for general *excellence*, not for military excellence alone, for it has as its complementary genitives σοφίης κτέ. Thus, too, Schweighaeuser takes it in his lexicon: “*praemium virtutis sive bellicae sive civilis*” (VIII 123, 124, 11). While in his commentary Schw. passes by the words in question without remark, in his lexicon he quotes the passage with a complement of his own: “ἀριστήϊα μὲν (nempe ἀρετῆς πολεμικῆς vel ἀνδραγαθίης) ἔδοσαν Εὐρυβιάδῃ κτέ. Blakesley (London, 1854) by his pointing shows that he feels the compression of the sentence and strives to render it as clear as possible: ἀριστήϊα μὲν νυν ἔδοσαν Εὐρυβιάδῃ, ἐλαίης στέφανον· σοφίης δὲ καὶ δεξιότητος, Θεμιστοκλέϊ, καὶ τούτῳ στέφανον ἐλαίης. Baehr (Leipzig, 1861) points a comma after the first στέφανον. Stein practically supports the view of Schweighaeuser, but goes further in expressing it in his editing, for he assumes a lacuna before Εὐρυβιάδῃ. The lacuna seems to be so evident that we have only to look for a specific correlative for σοφίης. In Attic it would probably have been ἀνδρείας, but Herodotus uses ἀνδραγαθίη seven times (Schweigh. l. I 99; I 136; IV 65; V 39, 42; VI 128; VIII 166), whereas ἀνδρηγή occurs but once, VII 99.

2. In Dinarchus c. Dem. 28 there is an ἀναδίπλωσις: μισθωτὸς οὗτος, ὃ Ἀθηναῖοι, μισθωτὸς οὗτος ἐστὶ παλαιός. I would propose to bracket the second οὗτος, this probably being due to dittographia of a copyist. It is exceedingly awkward and renders heavy the rhetorical iteration of which it is a part; the emphasis—and therefore this contrivance of emphasis—is concentrated on the predicate, not on the subject. Cf. Dinarchus' habit elsewhere: τότε, ὃ

'Α. τότε, Dem. 76; καλῶς γὰρ ὃ 'Α., καλῶς οἱ πρόγονοι περὶ τούτων ψηφισάμενοι, c. Aristog. 24; ἐκεῖνοι ἦσαν, ἐκεῖνοι, ὃ 'Α., ἄξιοι σύμβουλοι, c. Dem. 40; ἀκριβῶς γὰρ ἴστε, ὃ 'Αθηναῖοι, ἀκριβῶς, ὅτι, c. Philocr. 22—generally there is some *one* particular word.

3. Din. c. Aristog. §15. The tradition reads: καὶ τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐγκαλέσειεν ὑμῖν τοῖς τοῦτον δεχομένοις σύμβουλον; This reading makes the participle attributive, and implies that the Athenians receive, or admit, Aristogiton (the defendant in the case) as an adviser, actually then, or habitually. But the context and the argument do not agree with this. The entire matter is in suspense; the efforts of the speaker are made to gain a verdict of guilty against Aristogiton, and thus *avert that which is at the moment merely an ideal contingency*. The participle δεχομένοις contains the *protasis* to ἐγκαλέσειεν ἂν. A slight change, I believe, will suffice to restore to the participle its appropriate force: καὶ τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐγκαλέσειεν ὑμῖν τοιοῦτον δεχομένοις σύμβουλον; and who would not blame you in case you should (acquit this man and thus) admit such a person as an adviser?

4. In Din. c. Aristog. 15 I would suggest the insertion of οὐδὲν *after* οὐδεπώποτε: τὸν δὲ κατάρaton τοῦτον δς ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἡμᾶς πεποίηκεν οὐδεπώποτε <οὐδὲν> ἐξ οὗ πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν προσεήλυθε, cf. Krüger Synt. §67, 12.

5. Plut. Lycurg. 13, 5: τρίτην δὲ ῥήτραν διαμνημονεύουσι τοῦ Λυκούργου τὴν κωλύουσαν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς πολεμίους στρατεύειν, ἵνα μὴ πολλάκις ἀμύνεσθαι ἐπιζόμενοι πολεμικοὶ γένωνται. πολλάκις does not seem to be in the right place. In its present relation to ἐπιζόμενοι it is pleonastic and senseless, and it is absurd to assume that the Spartiates should have been enjoined from making war upon the same people, i. e. to limit all their wars against a particular people to a single occurrence. I would therefore shift πολλάκις as follows: τὴν κωλύουσαν <πολλάκις> ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς πολεμίους στρατεύειν, ἵνα μὴ ἀμύνεσθαι ἐπιζόμενοι πολεμικοὶ γένωνται.

6. Xen. Anab. I 10, 10: βασιλεὺς παραμεινόμενος εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ σχῆμα κατέστησεν ἀντίαν τὴν φάλαγγα ὥσπερ <ὅτε> τὸ πρῶτον μαχούμενος συνήει. The ellipsis otherwise is very strained, and ὅτε could easily have dropped out through its juxtaposition to τό.

7. Ib. I 9, 10: καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ποτε <φίλους> προῖτο, ἐπεὶ ἅπαξ φίλος αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο—if this is taken not as referring particularly to the Milesian exiles, but as describing the bearing of Cyrus towards

his friends in general, then, indeed, there is no visible reference to αὐτοῖς. φίλους may have lapsed on account of the proximity of φίλος.

8. Ib. II 2, 34: For ἀκούσαθ' ὧν προσδοκεῖ μοι read προσδεῖν μοι δοκεῖ ὅτ προσδεῖν δοκεῖ μοι.

E. G. SIHLER.

Thucydides VII 43, 16, παραγγείλας δὲ πένθ' ἡμερῶν σιτία καὶ τοὺς λιθολόγους καὶ τέκτονας πάντας λαβὼν καὶ ἄλλην παρασκευὴν τοξεύματων τε καὶ ὅσα ἔδει, ἣν κρατῶσι, τειχίζοντας ἔχεν.

The commentators since Krüger (Classen, Stahl, van Herwerden, Boehme, Lamberton) have generally considered the text corrupt here. Krüger's note on τοξευμάτων is simply, "Hier erwart' ich ein oder kein anderes Wort." Madvig (Advers. Crit. I, p. 330) sustained Krüger's objection in the following words: "Recte Kruegerus τοξευμάτων in muniendi apparatu munitionem miratur; ad defendenda opera omni exercitu et omni telorum genere usuri erant. Videtur Thucydides μοχλευμάτων posuisse, machinas significans ad pondera movenda et sursum tollenda; etsi μοχλεύω, μοχλευτής, μόχλευσις apud scriptores reperitur, μόχλευμα non reperitur." Stahl adds to Madvig's comment: "Iam ante eum Meinekius in Herm. III, p. 360, λαξευμάτων coniecit, quod quanquam in lexicis non inveniretur, recte tamen a verbo λαξεύω derivatum esset idemque significaret atque IV 4, 1, σιδήρια λιθουργά. Idem tamen dubitat, an τοξεύματα hic sint tormenta, ut apud Procop. B. Goth. I 27, τῶν τε τοξευμάτων τὰς μηχανὰς καὶ τοὺς ἀμφὶ ταύτῃ (ταύτας?) τεχνίτας ἐν παρασκευῇ εἶχε. Sane iam Aen. Poliorc. 32, 8 πυρφόρα τοξεύματα inter μηχανήματα affert; sed τοξεύματα nullo addito indicio pro tormentis esse posse exemplis non probatur, et expeditionis Siciliensis tempore tormenta ad expugnandas munitiones nondum in usu erant. Cf. Rüst. et Koech. Hist. rei mil. Gr. p. 207, 29. Herw. Mnem. nov. ser. VIII, p. 298 delevit καὶ ἄλλην παρασκευὴν τοξευμάτων τε, qualia conicere tam facile quam improbabile est. Quis enim talia adscripserit? Probabilis emendatio nondum inventa est."

Jowett, in his note on this passage, sustains the traditional reading, saying, "The place of τοξεύματα between carpenters and siege implements affords no reason for doubting the reading. Archers were more needed in a siege than in battle." Lamberton evidently has this note in mind when he says (note on the passage), "Archers may be useful in a siege, but they have nothing to do with wall-building. The word is evidently wrong."